Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/723,212	WYBRO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tara L. Mayo	3671
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Amended</u>	
(1) <u>Tara L. Mayo</u> .	(3)	ļ
(2) Brett T. Cooke.	(4)	İ
Date of Interview: 25 August 2004	Time: <u>10:55 AM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	plicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: 12 and 15		
Prior art documents discussed: Belinsky (U.S. Patent No. 4,864,958)		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sumr 	The examiner will provide a wri	itten summary of the substance ne interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applic	(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: With regard to claim 12, Applicant's representative agreed to the change(s) set forth in the attached Examiner's Amendment. With regard to claim 15, the Examiner initally believed the claim to be unpatentable over Belinsky '958; however, Applicant's representative noted that the reference lacks a teaching for a plurality of watertight compartments as required by the claim.